REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 14-15, 17, 20-21 and 25-31 are pending. Applicant respectfully requests reexamination.

Claims 25, 27, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, for non-enablement. Specifically, the limitation "resilient buckling" is not supported in the specification. Applicant has amended each of these claims to recite "resilient collapse" in lieu of resilient buckling. In addition, Applicant has amended the specification to describe the resilient collapse limitation. Adequate support for resilient collapse is found in the original specification, *e.g.* at paragraph 0008 (resilient) and in FIGS. 8 and 9 (collapse). Accordingly, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 14-15, 17, 20-23 and 25-31 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 5,110,660 ("Wolf"), or in the alternative as obvious in view of Wolf. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite *a cavity having a bottom surface formed in the top end for receiving an electronic component.* Claims 10, 15 and 21 have been similarly amended. These amendments are fully supported in the specification, *e.g.* at paragraph 0023.

Wolf neither teaches nor suggests the cavity limitation. That is because his spring is designed to support great masses in automobiles, whereas the present invention is directed to providing a multi-axis isolator for securing board-mounted electronic components of much smaller mass. Moreover, Wolf's holes do not anticipate the cavity limitation, because unlike Wolf's spring, the claimed cavity has a bottom surface formed in one end of the isolator.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite:

> *first and second holes being sized and shaped for attenuating vibration at a second frequency along a lateral axis that is perpendicular to the vertical axis.*

Claims 10 and 21 include, or have been amended to include, a similar limitation.

The rejection in Part 5 of the Office Action credits Wolf with suggesting an isolator having holes sized and shaped for attenuating vibration at a second frequency along a lateral axis, and for support, cites to Wolf at col. 2 lines 49-53. Wolf does not support this rejection. The cited passage from Wolf says nothing, and suggests nothing, about attenuating vibration at a second frequency, or about attenuating vibration along an axis perpendicular to the vertical axis.

The cited passage from Wolf only suggests that hollow channels formed in a rubber matrix can soften its spring characteristic to prevent buckling. A mechanical engineer or person of ordinary skill in the art knows that buckling is a failure mode of a column caused by high compressive stress in an axial direction. Wolf therefore, is only concerned with attenuating force along the axial (or vertical) direction. Wolf's drawing (FIG. 2) shows only vertical force. Throughout his disclosure, he teaches a spring for suspending great masses that impose axial loads. Wolf, col. 1, line 50; col. 2, lines 20-24. Furthermore, Hooke's Law, $F = -kx$, tells us that the spring force F, whether in tension or compression, acts in one direction only (x). Wolf simply fails to anticipate or suggest attenuating frequency in a lateral direction.

As for dependent Claims 25-31, Applicant has amended these claims so that each recites limitations neither taught nor suggested by Wolf. Claims 25, 27, 29 and 30 claim an isolator that responds to shock in a first direction (*e.g.* along a lateral axis) by resilient collapse in a second direction that is normal to the first direction (*e.g.* along a vertical axis). Claims 26, 28 and 31 claim an isolator that responds to shock in a first direction (*e.g.* vertical, axial or longitudinal) by resilient collapse in the first direction. Support for these amendments can be found in the original specification, *e.g.* at paragraph 0008 and in FIGS. 8 and 9, and in the amended specification at paragraphs 0030 and 0031.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wolf. Applicant respectfully traverses. In view of the foregoing arguments for patentability of Claim 1 over Wolf, Applicant submits that Claim 3 is also allowable through dependency.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

Sean D. Burdick
Registration No. 51,513
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Telephone: (714) 427-7083
Facsimile: (714) 427-7799